## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION

	UNITED STATES OF A v.	MERICA, Plaintiff,	Case 1	Number <u>C</u>	CR08-70012HRL		
	JOSE SEDENO-PEREZ	, Defendant.	ORDER OF D	ETENTION	PENDING TRIAL		
	<b>.</b>	4.4.5.45.0					
	In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing was held on January 17, 2008. Defendant was present, represented by his attorney Manuel Araujo AFPD. The United States was represented by Assistant U.S.						
	Attamass Laff Calant	presented by his attorney Man	<u>iel Araujo</u> AFPD. The Unit	ted States wa	is represented by Assistant U.S.		
	Attorney <u>Jeff Schenk</u> .	A nn					
	PART I. PRESUMPTIONS		1 1 10 17 0 0 0 0 0 0				
	of a prior offense describe	/ / The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and the defendant has been convicted					
	neriod of not more than fi	prior offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) while on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense, and a					
	whichever is later.	od of not more than five (5) years has elapsed since the date of conviction or the release of the person from imprisonment,					
		rehuttable presumption that n	andition or combination	a.C. a. a. 4:4:			
	This establishes a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.						
	/ There is probable cause based upon (the indictment) (the facts found in Part IV below) to believe that the defendant						
	as committed an offense						
		for which a maximum term of	imprisonment of 10 years of	r more is pro	escribed in 21 U.S.C. S		
		801 et seq., § 951 et seq., or §		i more is pre	scribed in 21 U.S.C. §		
			<b>A</b> *	mission of a	felony		
		B under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c): use of a firearm during the commission of a felony.  This establishes a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the					
;	appearance of the defenda	ance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.					
		No presumption applies.					
		I. REBUTTAL OF PRESUMPTIONS, IF APPLICABLE					
		/ The defendant has not come forward with sufficient evidence to rebut the applicable presumption[s], and he					
1	therefore will be ordered of	efore will be ordered detained.					
	/ / The defendar	nt has come forward with evide	nce to rebut the applicable	presumption[	[s] to wit: .		
		of proof shifts back to the Unit					
	PART III. PROOF (WHER	E PRESUMPTIONS REBUTTED	OR INAPPLICABLE)				
The United States has proved to a preponderance of the evidence that no condition or combination of reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required, AND/OR							
		combination of conditions will					
	-	ty of any other person and the	•				
]		INGS OF FACT AND STATEMEN					
			s set out in 18 U.S.C. § 3142	2(g) and all o	of the information submitted at		
1	the hearing and finds as fo						
,	Defendant, ni	s attorney, and the AUSA have	waived written findings.				
j	PART V. DIRECTIONS RE						
00***		amitted to the custody of the A					
					eing held in custody pending appear	t l	
		ed a reasonable opportunity for t of an attorney for the Govern					
		Marshal for the purpose of an					
ucic	indant to the Office States	iviaishar for the purpose of an	appearance in confidential w	illi a court p	roceeding.		
	) /	,					
	1/1/1/2	$\checkmark$	1145	M-			
Date	$_{\text{ed}}$ : $\left[\begin{array}{c c} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{array}\right]$	0	1, 1				
	( )		HOWARD R LLOYD	/			
					,		

United States Magistrate Judge

AUSA \_\_\_\_, ATTY \_\_\_\_\_, PTS \_\_\_\_